

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,261	09/06/2004	Yue-Shiun Lee	NAUP0530USA	5260
27765	7590 11/15/2005		EXAMINER	
NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION			TAKAOKA, DEAN O	
P.O. BOX 50 MERRIFIEL	6 D, VA 22116		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBE	
	-,		2817	
			DATE MAILED: 11/15/200:	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	-				
	10/711,261	LEE ET AL.	m				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Dean O. Takaoka	2817					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence ad	dress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNI 36(a). In no event, however, may a vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MON cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this continuous that the continuous continuous that the continuou	•				
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	•						
	action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	ters, prosecution as to the	e merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	•	•					
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.							
, = , ,	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) 7-9 is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	r.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•	•					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti			FR 1.121(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	•	• •	• •				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			•				
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. §	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori			Stago				
application from the International Bureau	•	received in this National	Stage				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of		received					
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	• — _	Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		s)/Mail Date  nformal Patent Application (PTC	)-152)				
p / - /	<u> </u>	<del></del> '					

Application/Control Number: 10/711,261

Art Unit: 2817

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 – 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gneiting (Agilent NPL document 2001).

Gneiting shows a equivalent circuit for a RF MOS transistor comprising the limitations of the claims (in particular pages 6, 12, 17-19 and 26; where the first thru fourth blocks and channel blocks are merely a function of a simulation program and where any MOS transistor mounted on a substrate would inherently comprise block portions for simulation) wherein a product claim, only the final product is patentable, where Gneiting shows the RF transistor, substrate, and equivalent circuit.

It is the position of the Examiner that the recitation contained in the preamble has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Art Unit: 2817

ír.

claims, it should be noted that a "product-by-process" claim is directed to the <u>product per se</u>, no matter how such a product was made or used. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. It has been well established by the Courts that it is the patentability of the final product per se which must be determined in a "product-by-process" claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in "product-by-process" form or not. It should be noted that the applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above case law makes clear.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7 – 9 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Gneiting does not teach or suggest the specific claimed method where the switch comprises a second and/or third channel block, or the respective connections and elements of the second and third channels blocks, nor would it be obvious to combine the prior art of record, thus the claims are allowable.

### Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 10/711,261

Art Unit: 2817

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Cheng et al. teaches High-Frequency Small Signal AC and Noise Modeling of MOSFETs for RF IC Design.

Jang teaches Small-Signal Modeling of RF CMOS.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dean O. Takaoka whose telephone number is (571) 272-1772. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30a - 5:00p Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pascal can be reached on (571) 272-1769. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

dot

November 10, 2005